



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/786,313

02/25/2004

Ravipal S. Soin

MSFT-3501/300585.03

3447

23377 7590 04/03/2008

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP
CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR
2929 ARCH STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891

EXAMINER

RECEK, JASON D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2142

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/03/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/786,313	Applicant(s) SOIN ET AL.	
	Examiner JASON RECEK	Art Unit 2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-17 and 19-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-17 and 19-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to the amendment filed December 27th 2007 which concerns application 10/786313.

Status of Claims

Claims 1, 3-17 and 19-56 are pending, claims 2 and 18 have been cancelled.

Claims 1, 3-17 and 19-56 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, filed 12/27/07, with respect to the claim objections, 35 U.S.C. 101 and 112 rejections have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objections and 101 and 112 rejections have been withdrawn.

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 3-17 and 19-56 under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Masumoto does not specifically disclose all the amended features of the independent claims. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Masumoto US 6,943,752 and Parsons, Jr. et al. US 6,349,337 B1 and in further view of Dunlap et al. US 6,760,749 B1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1, 4-6, 10, 13, 16-17, 19-21, 23-30 and 49-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masumoto et al. U.S. Pat. 6,943,752 B2 in view of Parsons, Jr. et al. US 6,349,337 B1 and in further view of Dunlap et al. US 6,760,749 B1.

Regarding claim 1, Masumoto discloses “selecting ... via a first user interface mechanism of the computer device content for transmission to at least one alternate display device” as a presentation system where content is selected and transferred from one computer to a display device (col. 4 ln. 65 – col. 5 ln. 7), “said content includes public content and private content” as some of the content is not displayed on the display device (col. 5 ln. 15-21), “displaying on said computing device said content including both said public content and said private content” as showing all content on the computer (Fig. 5), and “transmitting at least said public content of the selected content to the at least one alternate display device, wherein if a public/private

mechanism is enabled on said computing device, when said content is rendered on the at least one alternate display device, only the public content is rendered” as transmitting content to the display device and only displaying part of the content (col. 5 ln. 15-21, Fig. 5).

Masumoto and Parsons disclose “establishing a remote session, via a remoting protocol, between the computing device and the at least one alternate display device” as the computer and display device are connected on a wireless network (Masumoto col. 16 ln. 8) which would necessary use some protocol. Applicant has argued that it is not inherent that a wireless session would use a protocol. Although it is still the examiner's position that a wireless communication session inherently uses some sort of protocol (if there was no protocol the session could not be established because the devices would not know how to communicate with each other), "establishing a remote session, via a remoting protocol" is also disclosed by Parsons as a communication session between client and server using a remote protocol (col. 6 ln. 2-7).

Masumoto and Parsons do not explicitly disclose “a plurality of alternate display devices” however it would be reasonable to assume that when giving a presentation to a large audience there will be more than one projector and thus Masumoto at least suggests a plurality of display devices. However this assumption is unnecessary because Dunlap explicitly discloses this limitation as a plurality of display devices (col. 9 ln. 12-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use remote sessions with Masumoto for the purpose of connecting to a

device over a network. Creating remote sessions between network devices by using a remote protocol is well known in the art and yields predictable results, as evidenced by Parsons, Jr. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have multiple display devices as taught by Dunlap for the purpose of giving a presentation. The motivation for doing so is to enhance user experience and the exchange of information (Dunlap col. 1 ln. 57 - col. 2 ln. 5).

Regarding claim 3, Masumoto does not disclose “the remoting protocol is the remote desktop protocol and the remote session is a terminal services (TS) session” however this is taught by Parsons, Jr. as using the Remote Desktop Protocol (col. 6 ln. 43-50) which would necessary include a terminal session.

Regarding claim 4, Masumoto discloses “authoring said content” as creating the presentation (col. 13 ln. 47-78).

Regarding claim 5, Masumoto discloses “publishing said content” as sending it to the display device (col. 15 ln. 59-61, Fig. 9).

Regarding claim 6, Masumoto discloses “content authored before said publishing is said public content and wherein at least one alternation to said public content after said publishing is said private content” as modifying data after it is published (col. 15 ln. 62-67, Fig. 18).

Regarding claim 10, Masumoto discloses “the content is substantially simultaneously displayed on the at least one alternate display device in response to said transmitting” as showing the display simultaneously (col. 5 ln. 15-19, Fig. 5).

Regarding claim 13, Masumoto discloses “said content is a slide presentation” as a slide presentation (col. 1 ln. 49-50, Fig. 5).

Regarding claim 16, Masumoto discloses “a computer readable medium [that performs the method of claim 1]” as Masumoto operates on a computer system and thus necessarily includes a computer readable medium (col. 5 ln. 1-5).

Regarding claim 17, Masumoto discloses “a computing device comprising means for performing the method of claim 1” as a computer which is capable of performing the method claimed (col. 5 ln. 1-5).

Regarding claims 19-21, 27, 29 they are directed to a computer medium which corresponds to the method of claims 1, 6, 5, 10, 12 respectively and are rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding claims 23-24 they are medium claims that correspond to the method claims 9 and 8 respectively and are therefore rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding claims 25-26 they are medium claims that correspond to the method claims 6 and 9 respectively in that claim 6 refers to designating an alteration as private and claim 9 refers to making, deleting and highlighting a private portion, thus they are rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding claims 28 and 30 Masumoto discloses “controlling the rendering” and “controls rendering of said at least one public portion and said at least one private portion” as selecting what content to show (col. 5 ln. 15-19).

Regarding claims 49-56 they are substantially similar to claims 19-21, 23-24 and 27-29 respectively, thus they are rejected for the same reasons.

2. Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masumoto, Parsons and Dunlap in view of Orfitelli et al. U.S. 6,904,451 B1.

Regarding claim 7, Masumoto discloses “designating [...] at least one portion of the content as private content” as displaying only a portion of the content (col. 5 ln. 15-19) however Masumoto does not disclose doing this “via a second user interface mechanism” but this is taught by Orfitelli as a touch screen computer that is used to control a presentation (col. 3 ln. 31-44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Masumoto by adding a second user interface as taught by Orfitelli. The motivation for doing so is to allow the presenter to quickly and easily modify the presentation data without retreating to a laptop or other computing device (i.e. server) that may be positioned across the room.

Regarding claim 8, Masumoto discloses “said authoring includes designating at least one alternation of said public content as private content” marking data as comments so they are not displayed to the public (col. 16 ln. 33-38).

Regarding claim 9, Masumoto discloses “said authoring includes designating at least one of a masking, a deletion, and a highlighting of said content as private content” as highlighting content to mark it as private (col. 15 ln. 65-67), deleting content (col. 15 ln. 67 – col. 16 ln. 2), and marking content as private (col. 16 ln. 36-37).

3. Claims 11-12 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masumoto, Parsons and Dunlap in view of Zhang et al. “Software Solution to Completely Wireless Presentation” 2001.

Regarding claim 11, Masumoto does not disclose “controlling the display of the public content on said at least one alternate display device via a second user interface mechanism on said computing device” however this is taught by Zhang as a user interface for application presentation (content selection) and a user interface for controlling the presentation (control mechanism) see pg. 463 section 4.4 User Interface.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Masumoto by providing another user interface for the purpose of controlling the presentation. The motivation for doing so is to project a clear image of the content.

Regarding claim 12, Masumoto discloses “said controlling includes controlling a rate of viewing of said content via at least one input device of said computing device” as a computer connected to a projector in which the computer controls the presentation (col. 5 ln. 2-3, Fig. 1), also a remote control may used (col. 5 ln. 4-5, Fig. 5).

Regarding claim 32, Masumoto discloses “at least one projector device” as a projector (col. 5 ln. 2, Fig. 5). Masumoto does not disclose “at least one available other notebook computer” however this is taught by Zhang as other laptop computers that are connected to the network (page. 459 section 1 Introduction, Fig. 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Masumoto by adding additional computing devices to the network for the purpose of having more displays. Zhang teaches that if other laptops are connected users can see the presentation on their own screen.

4. Claims 33 – 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang in view of Masumoto and in view of Parsons Jr.

Regarding claim 33, Zhang discloses “a server” as a server (pg. 460 section 3), “a user interface” as a user interface (pg. 463 section 4.4), and “a transmitter” as all computing devices are in wireless communication so they must include a transmitter (pg. 463 section 5, Fig. 6). Zhang does not disclose “public content and private content” nor “only the public content is rendered” however this is taught by Masumoto as having public and private content and only displaying the public content (col. 5 ln. 15-19, Fig. 5).

Zhang does not disclose “establishing a remote session, via a remoting protocol, between the server computing device and the at least one client display device” however this is suggested by Masumoto as the computer and display device are connected on a wireless network (Masumoto col. 16 ln. 8) which would necessary use some protocol. Applicant has argued that it is not inherent that a wireless session would use a protocol. Although it is still the examiner's position that a wireless communication session inherently uses some sort of protocol (if there was no protocol

the session could not be established because the devices would not know how to communicate with each other), Parsons explicitly discloses this as a communication session between client and server using a remote protocol (col. 6 ln. 2-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zhang by incorporating the public/private data distinction as taught by Masumoto for the purpose of giving a more effective presentation. The motivation for doing so is provided by Masumoto as allowing the presenter to refer to notes without allowing the audience to see the notes. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use remote sessions for the purpose of connecting to a device over a network. Creating remote sessions between network devices by using a remote protocol is well known in the art and yields predictable results, as evidenced by Parsons, Jr.

Regarding claim 34, Zhang discloses “an authoring tool” as the server is connected to the projector and thus must contain the presentation software (pg. 460 section 3.1).

Regarding claim 35, Zhang discloses “a publishing tool” as the server must “publish” the material to the projector / other computing devices (pg. 460 section 3.1, pg. 462 section 4.3 Fig. 4).

Regarding claim 36, Zhang does not disclose “said publishing is said public content and wherein at least one alteration to said public content after publishing with the publishing tool is said private content” however this is taught by Masumoto as converting data from public content to private content (col. 15 ln. 63-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zhang by incorporating the public/private data distinction as taught by Masumoto for the purpose of giving a more effective presentation. The motivation for doing so is provided by Masumoto as allowing the presenter to refer to notes without allowing the audience to see the notes.

Regarding claim 37, Zhang does not disclose “at least one portion of the content is designated as private content via said user interface” however this is taught by Masumoto as designated portions as private content (col. 17 ln. 36-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zhang by incorporating the public/private data distinction as taught by Masumoto for the purpose of giving a more effective presentation. The motivation for doing so is provided by Masumoto as allowing the presenter to refer to notes without allowing the audience to see the notes.

Regarding claim 38, Zhang does not disclose “at least one alteration of said public content made via said authoring tool is designated as private content” however this is taught by Masumoto as designating private content, such content can be an alteration of said public content (col. 16 ln. 33-38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zhang by incorporating the public/private data distinction as taught by Masumoto for the purpose of giving a more effective presentation. The motivation for doing so is provided by Masumoto as allowing the presenter to refer to notes without allowing the audience to see the notes.

Regarding claim 39, Zhang does not disclose “at least one alteration includes at least one of a masking, a deletion, an annotating and a highlighting” however this is taught by Masumoto as highlighting content to mark it as private (col. 15 ln. 65-67), deleting content (col. 15 ln. 67 – col. 16 ln. 2), and marking content as private (col. 16 ln. 36-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zhang by incorporating the public/private data distinction as taught by Masumoto for the purpose of giving a more effective presentation. The motivation for doing so is provided by Masumoto as allowing the presenter to refer to notes without allowing the audience to see the notes.

Regarding claim 40, Zhang discloses “the rendering of the public content on said at least one client display device is controlled via said user interface” as controlling a display through a user interface (pg. 463 section 4.4)

Regarding claim 41, Zhang does not specifically disclose “control of a rate of display” however Masumoto teaches using slides for a presentation (col. 1 ln. 49-50) and a slide presentation inherently has a rate control.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the presentation system of Zhang to use slide presentation applications. Such applications are well known and yield predictable results.

Regarding claim 42, Zhang does not specifically disclose “said content is a slide presentation however this is taught by Masumoto as using slides for a presentation (col. 1 ln. 49-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the presentation system of Zhang to use slide presentation applications. Such applications are well known and yield predictable results.

Regarding claim 43, neither Zhang nor Masumoto expressly disclose “transmits only said public content of the selected content to the at least one client display device” however the method and system taught by Masumoto achieves the result of only showing the public content. Masumoto teaches “hiding” the private content rather than not transferring it however the result is the same either way. Thus the motivation for transmitting only public content is to hide private content which is exactly what Masumoto discloses. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to simply not transfer the private data for the purpose of keeping it private, especially given the motivation and teaching of Masumoto.

Regarding claim 44, Zhang discloses “a user interface” as a user interface (pg. 463 section 4.4), “means for displaying” as laptop with a display screen (pg. 459 section 1), and “means for transmitting” as all computing devices are in wireless communication so they must include a transmitter (pg. 463 section 5, Fig. 6). Zhang does not disclose “public content and private content” nor “only the public content is rendered” however this is taught by Masumoto as having public and private content and only displaying the public content (col. 5 ln. 15-19, Fig. 5).

Zhang does not disclose “establishing a remote session, via a remoting protocol, between the computing device and the at least one alternate display device” however this is suggested by Masumoto as the computer and display device are connected on a wireless network (Masumoto col. 16 ln. 8) which would necessary use some protocol. Applicant has argued that it is not inherent that a wireless session would use a protocol.

Although it is still the examiner's position that a wireless communication session inherently uses some sort of protocol (if there was no protocol the session could not be established because the devices would not know how to communicate with each other), Parsons explicitly discloses this as a communication session between client and server using a remote protocol (col. 6 ln. 2-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zhang by incorporating the public/private data distinction as taught by Masumoto for the purpose of giving a more effective presentation. The motivation for doing so is provided by Masumoto as allowing the presenter to refer to notes without allowing the audience to see the notes. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use remote sessions for the purpose of connecting to a device over a network. Creating remote sessions between network devices by using a remote protocol is well known in the art and yields predictable results, as evidenced by Parsons, Jr.

Regarding claims 45-48, they are substantially similar to claims 36-37, 40 and 43 respectively, thus they are rejected for the same reasons given above.

5. Claims 14-15 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masumoto, Parsons and Dunlap.

Regarding claim 14, Masumoto does not expressly disclose “displaying via a second user interface mechanism an indication of a signal strength associated with the remote session” however this is well known in the art when dealing with wireless networks to display a signal strength, it yields predictable results in that a user will know when a signal (network) is available.

Regarding claim 15, Masumoto does not expressly disclose “transmitting only said public content of the selected content to the at least one alternate display device” however the method and system taught by Masumoto achieves the result of only showing the public content. Masumoto teaches “hiding” the private content rather than not transferring it however the result is the same either way. Thus the motivation for transmitting only public content is to hide private content which is exactly what Masumoto discloses. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to simply not transfer the private data for the purpose of keeping it private, especially given the motivation and teaching of Masumoto.

Regarding claim 31, it is a medium claim that corresponds to the method claim 15 and is therefore rejected for the same reasons.

6. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masumoto, Parsons, Dunlap and in view of Acharya et al. US 2005/0036509 A1.

Regarding claim 22, Masumoto does not specifically disclose “said computing device is a stylus pen input device and said publishing includes printing said at least one public portion to a journal” however this is taught by Acharya as using PDAs as the wireless computing device and printing content to be presented (paragraph 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to using PDAs for the computing devices and to print a copy of the presentation. Such techniques are widely known and yield predictable results.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2142

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JASON RECEK whose telephone number is (571)270-1975. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jason Recek/
Examiner, Art Unit 2142
(571)-270-1975

/Andrew Caldwell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2142